UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/507,025	01/25/2005	Mario Pinza	257550US0PCT 7690	
22850 OBLON. SPIV	7590 11/05/2007 YAK, MCCLELLAND MA	EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE STREET			FAY, ZOHREH A	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1618	
	•			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/05/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/507,025	PINZA ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Zohreh A. Fay	1618				
	ne MAILING DATE of this communication app	- ,					
Period for Re	• •						
WHICHE - Extensions after SIX (6 - If NO perio - Failure to r Any reply r	FENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY VER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In the second of	TE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror cause the application to become ABANDON	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠ Res	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 August 2007</u> .						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of	of Claims						
4)⊠ Cla	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
· <u> </u>	im(s) is/are allowed.						
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected. 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
·	im(s) is/are objected to: im(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement					
on the subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application I	Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
	er 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
		•					
	•						
Attachment(s)							
	References Cited (PTO-892) Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail D					
3) Informatio	n Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1618

Claims 1-24 are presented for examination.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 15, 2007 has been entered.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

Application/Control Number: 10/507,025

Art Unit: 1618

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson et al. (U.S. Patent 4,490,389) in view of Fritsch et al. (U.S. Patent 5,445,827).

Nelson et al. teach the use of ascorbic acid in combination with tromethamine in a contact lens solution. See column 3, lines 5-10 and column 4, lines 34-40. The above reference differs from the claimed invention in using L-ascorbic acid or the addition of anti-inflammatory agent in some of the dependent claims. Fritsch et al. teach the use of ascorbic acid, an anti-inflammatory agent in combination with agents such as lysine, arginin and N-methyl glucosamine in a pharmaceutical formulation. See column 2, lines 35-45 and column 3, lines 14-20. It would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art to use L-ascorbic acid, considering that the stereoisomers have the same activity as the racemic mixture with the different degree of effectiveness. To add an anti-inflammatory agent to ascorbic acid mixture would have also been obvious to a person skilled in the art, considering that Fritsch et al. teach the addition of such agents to ascorbic acid as old.

One skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of the above references, since one relates to the use of ascorbic acid in combination with the claimed amines such as tromethamine in a pharmaceutical composition and the other relates to the addition of an anti-inflammatory agent to an organic base and ascorbic

Art Unit: 1618

acid. The substitution of one anti-inflammatory agent for another would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art in the absence of evidence to the contrary. The determination of optimum proportions or amounts is considered to be within the skill of the artisan.

Applicant's arguments and remarks have been carefully considered, but are not deemed to be persuasive. Applicant alleges criticality to the specific PH of the claimed invention in comparison with the PH taught by the prior art. The allegation is not well taken. There is no evidence of the record to demonstrate the advantages of the claimed composition having the specific PH over the composition of the prior art. Furthermore, the lower limit of the PH taught by Nelson reference is very close to the higher limit of the claimed PH. Therefore, the slight modification of PH in the absence of evidence to the advantages of such difference does not create a patentably distinct composition.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zohreh A. Fay whose telephone number is (571) 272-0573. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Hartley can be reached on (571) 272-0616. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/507,025

Art Unit: 1618

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Z.F

/Zohreh Fay/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1618